

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 and 48-85 are now pending in the application. Support for the amendments to the claims can be found throughout the drawings and specification. As such, no new matter is added. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3-6, 48-50, 52, 54-57, 59-61, 63, 65-71, 73-79, and 81-85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Gary et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,662,253). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to claim 63, Gary fails to show, teach, or suggest at least a servo controller interface comprising a first interface for communicating with a first processor over a first bus at a first rate and a second interface for communicating with a second processor over a second bus at a second rate.

For anticipation to be present under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), there must be no difference between the claimed invention and the reference disclosure as viewed by one skilled in the field of the invention. Scripps Clinic & Res. Found. V. Genentech, Inc., 18 USPQ.2d 1001 (Fed. Cir. 1991). All of the limitations of the claim must be inherent or expressly disclosed and must be arranged as in the claim. Constant v. Advanced Micro-Devices, Inc., 7 USPQ.2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Here, Gary fails to disclose the limitation that the servo controller interface includes the first and second interfaces for communicating with first and second processors at different rates.

As shown in an exemplary embodiment in FIG. 2B of the present application, a servo controller 216 communicates with other components of an embedded disk controller 200 via a servo controller interface 211. The servo controller interface 211 includes various interfaces for communicating with respective processors. For example, the servo controller interface 211 includes interfaces 214 and 215 for communicating with processors 232 and 240, respectively.

Applicants respectfully note that when different processors and their respective buses operate at different frequencies and/or in different clock domains, conflicts may arise. As such, the servo controller interface 211 may include a speed matching module (for example only, FIFO 1206) that resolves these conflicts. The first and second interfaces of the servo controller interface 211 communicate with the respective processors at different rates.

In contrast, the Examiner relies on buffer memory 104 of Gary to disclose a speed matching module. Applicants respectfully submit that a buffer memory that stores data being transferred between a host and a disk drive is not related to a servo controller interface that includes first and second interfaces for communicating with different processors at different rates. For example, the Examiner relies on Column 3, Lines 48-51 of Gary to disclose this limitation, which state that "buffer memory 104 is used to overcome differences between the speed at which host 101 operates as compared to the speed at which disk assembly 107 operates." Applicants respectfully note that neither this cited portion nor any other portion of Gary discloses first and second interfaces of a servo controller interface that communicate with first and second processors, respectively, at different rates.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's interpretation that the entirety of disk drive system 100, including the external buffer 104, is a "servo controller interface" is improper. For example, an interface is "the place at which independent and often unrelated systems meet and act on or communicate with each other." (Please see <http://www.m-w.com/dictionary/interface>). Consequently, a servo controller interface is the point at which the servo controller communicates with other independent systems. Here, Gary discloses that disk controller 103 includes servo controller 108 and that the buffer 104 is external to the disk controller 103. As such, the buffer 104 is not part of an "interface" between the servo controller 108 and any other component of the disk controller 103.


In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 63, as well as its dependent claims, should be allowable for at least the above reasons. Claims 1, 52, 71, and 79, as well as their corresponding dependent claims, should be allowable for at least similar reasons.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 8, 2008

By: 
Michael D. Wiggins
Reg. No. 34,754

Damian M. Aquino
Reg. No. 54,964

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MDW/DMA/dms